DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 201 UD 020 313

AUTHOR	Carney, M., Ed.: And Others
TITLE	Inservice Training in Desegregated School Districts: Midwest Region Case Studies.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Rand-N-1252-NIE
PUB DATE	Aug 79
CONTRACT	400-78-0068
NOTE	65p.: For a related document see UD 020 315. Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Rand Corporation, Publications Department, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406 ($5.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators: Case Studies: Elementary Secondary Education: *Inservice Education: *Program Effectiveness: *School Desegregation: School Districts: *Staff Development: Teachers

ABSTRACT

This booklet contains case studies of inservice staff development programs that were implemented as organizational responses to school desegregation in six midwestern school districts. The districts range in student population from 6,000 to 44,000, and were initially desegregated between 1970 and 1978. A team of interviewers visited each of the districts and interviewed administrators, inservice trainers and training program participants (teachers and administrators). Each case study presented provides a brief description of the locality and desegregation plan, an overview of the district's major inservice program, an account of the inservice training planning procedures, and a discussion of the impact and/or outcomes of the inservice programs as determined through field interviews and the impressions of the field study team. The six districts studied are not identified by name. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UD

N-1262-NIE

August 1979

INSERVICE TRAINING IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOL DISTRICTS: MIDWEST BOSTON CASE STUDIES

M. Carway (ed.), M. Carney, E. Davila, R. Mahard, B. Osthimer

A Rand Note

prepared for the

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ED189201

Rand

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tom Cockrell
Rand Corp.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-78-0068 with the National Institute of Education. The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the author, and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the United States Government.

The Rand Publications Series: The Report is the principal publication documenting and transmitting Rand's major research findings and final research results. The Rand Note reports other outputs of sponsored research for general distribution. Publications of The Rand Corporation do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of Rand research.

Published by The Rand Corporation

PREFACE

This Note contains case studies from the first national study of inservice training programs in desegregated school districts. The research is sponsored by the National Institute of Education under Contract 400-78-0068-HEW, with Nicelma King as the study director. The study has two goals.

1. *To describe the process of staff development as an organizational response to school desegregation:* Who has been involved in the training programs? Who are the decisionmakers? How is the training delivered? How has it been received? Is it related to particular desegregation-oriented problems?
2. *To propose hypotheses that will be instrumental to further study of the role of staff development in the desegregation process.*

These case studies are helpful in achieving the first of these goals: describing the process of staff development. Written at the conclusion of the fieldwork of the study, they are an interim product that will be used in producing the final study report.

The study included fieldwork in sixteen districts located in the East, Midwest, and West. The sites were purposely selected as successfully desegregated districts which fit into various categories of size, stage of desegregation, and method of staff development. A reputational approach for selecting successful school districts was used; the selections being made from a pool of nominations solicited from nationally recognized desegregation experts. The districts ranged in student population between 4,400 and 65,000, and all had desegregated between 1970 and 1978.

Teams of interviewers were sent to each of the sixteen school districts. Interviews were held in the district's central administrative offices, the local school board, the community, the inservice training organizations, and several schools. The interviewers attempted to identify participants in each of the training programs, as well as individuals who planned and designed the programs. Attempts were also made to determine how the training was delivered and how it was received, and to establish the relationship of training to the desegregation effort.

A case study was prepared for each district. It provides a brief description of the locality and desegregation plan as a context within which the inservice training programs operate, an overview of the district's major inservice programs, an account of the inservice planning procedures, and a discussion of the impact or outcomes of the inservice programs as determined through field interviews and the impressions of the field study team. For purposes of confidentiality, fictitious district names are used in all case studies.

There are several reasons for publication of the case studies apart from the final report: It is expected that this material will be helpful to staffs of other desegregating districts by providing a dispassionate description of the desegregation process in selected school districts. In-district and out-of-district trainers should find the contents useful in planning desegregation-related staff development programs. The studies can be used in determining how program funds for desegregation-related inservice training are being allocated. In addition, the material can be used to establish a basis for the formation of exploratory hypotheses concerning desegregation-related staff development programs.

SUMMARY

This Note describes the inservice training programs in six midwestern school districts. The districts range in student population from 6,000 to 44,000 and initially desegregated between 1970 and 1978. A team of interviewers visited each of the districts and interviewed approximately 40 administrators, inservice trainers, and training program participants. A case study was prepared for each district providing a brief description of the locality and desegregation plan as a context within which the inservice training programs operate, an overview of the district's major inservice programs, an account of the inservice planning procedures, and a discussion of the impact and/or outcomes of the inservice programs as determined through field interviews and the impressions of the field study team. The case studies constitute one part of the data collected during the site visits. Additional data gathered from the interviews will permit further analysis of specific training programs and the responses of trainers and participants to these programs. A final report for the study will incorporate data from the case studies and from the detailed interview responses.

GLOSSARY

The following are acronyms which appear in the case studies:

DAC	Desegregation Assistance Center, formerly *GAC*, or General Assistance Center, funded by *TITLE IV* of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act, commonly associated with *TITLE I*, compensatory education programs, and *TITLE IV C*, dissemination programs.
ESAA	Emergency School Aid Act. A program which is intended to assist desegregating school districts with problems occasioned by desegregation. Also known as *TITLE 7* because it was funded as *TITLE 7* of the Education Amendments of 1974.
LEA	Local Education Agency, usually a school district.
OCR	The Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
SEA	State Education Agency. May refer to the entire agency, or specifically to the unit within the agency created to provide desegregation-related technical assistance.
TI	Training Institute to assist school personnel with staff development problems associated with desegregation (RACE) or sex discrimination (SEX). Both types of institutes are funded by *TITLE IV* of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
USOE	United States Office of Education.

Carson School District
Midwest Region

Beth Osthimer

INTRODUCTION

The Carson School System has a student population of approximately 44,000, with a minority student enrollment of 26 percent (20 percent black, 4 percent Native American, 2 percent other minorities). It is divided into three autonomous K-12 areas. Area I has the largest minority student population, with a high concentration of blacks, as well as Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans. Areas II and III are predominately white, with "pocket" communities of both blacks and Native Americans. The city has undergone more than a decade of urban redevelopment, which has resulted in a well-developed, modern downtown business area.

In 1973, when the Carson Board of Education adopted its reorganization-decentralization plan to allocate decisionmaking authority from the Central Office administration to the three areas, the total student enrollment was approximately 58,000. From a peak enrollment figure of 72,000 in 1970, the projected enrollment for next year of 36,000 is a 50 percent decline in less than a decade. This marked decline and its appreciable effects on building closures, budgetary allocations and excessing of teachers from the system, provides a context for an examination of current desegregation-related staff development programs. Additionally, the school district administration has undergone significant changes in the last several years, most notably a change in superintendents.

BACKGROUND OF THE DESEGREGATION PLAN

The processes involved in the development of the desegregation/integration plan in Carson were multifold. A convenient starting point for the discussion is the Board of Education's adoption of its first "human relations guidelines" in 1967. These guidelines, among other things, established a voluntary urban transfer program to help promote

racial balance. Collaterally, efforts were initiated to establish an ethnic studies program. A group of black parents pressed for and obtained a Board resolution calling for a black studies curriculum. In 1969, a department of intergroup education was formed under an assistant superintendent, with responsibilities in the areas of ethnic studies and racial issues in education. In 1970 a definitive statement relating the quality of education to the racial composition of a school was adopted. Some voluntary efforts were taking place in the district prior to two important events in the desegregation history of the Carson schools: the filing of a lawsuit by the NAACP against the Board of Education and the issuing of state racial guidelines.

In 1970, the State Board of Education issued guidelines establishing a 30 percent minority ceiling for student enrollment in state schools. The racial balance in seventeen schools in Carson was found "unacceptable" by the state commissioner of education in 1971, and the district was asked to develop and file a desegregation plan of action. At the same time, the NAACP suit was filed, charging the district with the intentional pursuit of policies resulting in racial segregation.

Three separate proposals were developed prior to the adoption of "the fourth plan" by the Carson Board of Education in April 1972. The "fourth plan" provided the elimination of a maximum number of racially isolated schools without the use of mass cross-city busing; the replacement of obsolete elementary buildings with "expanded community" schools, resulting in fifteen building closures; grouping of students in schools that serve a narrower needs range, i.e. K-3, 4-6, 7-8; and at the secondary level, a number of boundary changes between contiguous school neighborhoods.

A survey team had documented the condition of a significant number of school buildings as potential fire hazards and/or not meeting building code specifications. The district, prior to desegregation, had been unsuccessful in efforts to pass a bond issue to pay for the costs involved in renovating and rebuilding these schools. With desegregation, many of these obsolete buildings in minority neighborhoods were closed and replaced with new, large complexes housing close to

1800 students and serving "expanded community" school areas.

In May 1972, one month after the "fourth plan" was adopted by the Board, a U.S. District Court placed Carson under order to desegregate. The NAACP suit had been filed in anticipation of the possibility that the more "voluntary" plan might be jeopardized by the election of several anti-busing candidates to the School Board in the spring of 1971. The order stipulated that the combined minority enrollment at any building could not exceed 42 percent, and no more than 35 percent could be of any one minority group. These percentages were later modified to 46 and 39, respectively. The order further mandated one minority teacher at every building within the district.

The desegregation plan utilized several methods to achieve the racial balances mandated by the court. The district located new, expanded community building sites in minority attendance areas with "magnet-type" programs including traditional self-contained classrooms, fundamental programs, continuous progress and modified-open programs. This expanded the district's efforts, through a federally-funded project, to offer realistic alternatives and educational choices in conjunction with a desegregated setting. The racial balance in these buildings is currently maintained through a program of "controlled enrollment," which reassigns students to schools other than those in their "home" attendance area if the minority student enrollment there exceeds the percentages allowed by the court (based on a sight-count). Students are also given the option of rematriculating to their "home" school if the racial percentages fall below those allowed by the court. The district currently believes that it is in compliance with the requirements of the court, although the judge has not yet issued a report to this effect; and its desegregation goal is to stay in compliance with the court order.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The district's desegregation/integration plan addresses the broad areas of curriculum development, pupil reassignment, and staff

development. The primary thrust of the district's effort in desegregation-related inservice took place in 1972, with a district-wide mandated human relations training program. This mandate coincided with the passage of a state law requiring teachers not holding life certificates to participate in 60 hours of human relations training. The district was also responding to the unions' demands on behalf of teachers who wanted to know how they would be involved in and affected by desegregation. Release time was provided on Tuesday afternoons throughout the year, and a certain percentage of that time was earmarked for human relations training. This basic format continued through 1978, when the state legislature prohibited the early dismissal of school for the purpose of providing release time to teachers. Instead, the legislature substituted a plan whereby "staff development days" would be dispersed far less frequently throughout the year, but would be allocated as entire, pupil-free days for the purposes of parent-teacher conferences and staff development.

The content of the first year of desegregation-related inservice focused on communication skills. There were a variety of options and course offerings open to the teachers to enable them to meet the re-certification requirements of the state. These were supported in part by district funds and in part by the participants' own resources (e.g., fees for courses undertaken for college credit). In 1974 and 1975, a district-wide study on institutional racism was mandated by the Board as a continuation of the staff development training in communication skills. During 1974, building staffs were to meet and define institutional racism; and during 1975, they were to find and categorize examples of racism. This process was to provide an overall needs assessment/guideline for the development of proposals to eliminate racism over the following years, including proposals for human relations training programs for staffs.

A jointly operated University/Carson School District Teacher Center was established in 1973. This center provided training related to the options in education presented through the district's alternative programs, but was not mentioned by respondents as providing desegregation-related inservice. In 1977, the district pulled its funding from the Teacher Center.

In addition to the ongoing staff development training which is handled through the Area offices, an Ethnic Culture Center provides curriculum resource materials and training for utilization of a multiethnic curriculum. The Center began as the Task Force on Minority Cultures in the late 1960's. The emphasis was on black and Indian cultures until 1971 when the Task Force became the Crisis Center on Ethnic Cultures and began to expand its emphasis to include other minority groups. The Ethnic Culture Center emerged in 1975, and began to examine the ethnic cultures and contributions of all groups in the society. From 1971 to the present, the emphasis has been on the positive contributions of all ethnic groups and on a multiethnic curriculum, rather than on minority studies. The Center at one time had a staff of ten; but, due to budget cutbacks, it is presently operating with only a director. The Center, as is the case with much of the staff development training for desegregation in Carson, has been supported in large part by district funds.

ESAA Special Project funds are currently being used to support a dropout project which has a staff development component, and the state Department of Education provides consultants, assistance and some stipends for inservice programs. The district relies on its own resource people, both in curriculum and human relations, to provide staff development training and assistance to building staffs for site-level programs.

SPECIFIC STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

One staff development program in multiethnic curriculum development began several years ago through the Ethnic Culture Center. Its purpose was to utilize teachers to train other teachers in the theory, development and use of multiethnic curriculum. There was an emphasis on the professional growth of the teachers who volunteered to participate. The teachers were released from their classroom duties to spend a part of their time thinking and developing materials which they could then

take back into their classroom. The Center provided the substitutes for participants, and the basic program lasted for three days.

The first day of the workshop was spent discussing the philosophy of cultural pluralism, separatism, and the melting pot theory. The last portion of the first day and all of the second day was spent showing specific sample lessons and teaching the participants how to teach multicultural materials. The third day was spent with the participants developing their own lessons to use with their students. The trainers for the program were specially trained teachers who, under the auspices of the Center, had taken various multicultural models and reduced and applied them to the Carson context.

District funds paid the salaries of the Center staff people, as well as the costs of substitutes for the classroom teachers attending the workshops. In addition to Carson teachers, out-of-district and even out-of-state personnel attended these workshops as space permitted. The target population of this workshop, like most of the desegregation-related inservice conducted in this district, was the teacher.

There was no followup component built into this program, although some efforts were made last year to check the buildings to see if the materials were really being used and if there was any impact on classroom activities. With the budget cutbacks, the Center staff is now reduced to the director, and the trained teachers are either back in the classroom or functioning as resource teachers in the district on call to assist other classroom teachers on a request basis.

The purpose of this series of workshops (offered repeatedly over the course of several years) was to collect multicultural materials, help teachers to use them effectively, and to allow participants to identify their own ethnicity and to feel better about teaching a multiethnic curriculum. The major criticism of the program was that it generated a lot of material, but did not provide either the time or the tools to effectively integrate the "multiethnic curriculum" into the "regular" curriculum. In response to this dissatisfaction, expressed both by participants and trainers, a series of workshops on integration of multiethnic curriculum has been developed by district

curriculum resource teachers in the social sciences and the Ethnic Culture Center staff in conjunction with the state Department of Education.

The workshops on integrating the curriculum are generally held for five days, on a released time basis, for a group of about 20 teachers. There is some preselection of participants, in order to insure that they are really interested and committed. The process entails formulating lesson plans one week, going back and using them in the classroom, reporting back to the group, and passing on the information acquired to their respective building staffs. An outside consultant is used for one session, with in-district resource people conducting the other sessions. An informal needs assessment/planning process is conducted, once the group meets together, to plan the course of the meetings. Some meetings are held at district locations, others are held outside. (For example, a local museum had an ethnic art exhibit which was visited during a day's activities.) The participants are given time to go through the materials compiled by the Ethnic Culture Center, look them over, choose lesson plans from which they actually teach a class, and report back to the group about their experiences with the lesson. Since this workshop was designed as a result of the expressed dissatisfaction of teachers with the lack of time for such activities, the responses to the workshop were fairly positive.

Another workshop, again held in conjunction with the state Department of Education, provided a forum for a newly clustered group of schools under the expanded desegregation plan. This three-school workshop was designed to fulfill the individual needs of the participant in terms of their feelings and problems regarding desegregation, controlled enrollment, and other concerns. The secondary goal of the workshop was to design a "plan of action" for the three buildings to enable them to cooperate and coordinate their efforts.

The format of this workshop consisted of 5 evening meetings, five hours each, over a period of five weeks. Attendance was voluntary, with around 20 teachers participating. A stipend was paid for attendance, and respondents varied widely on their perceptions of the importance of the stipend as an incentive. A different facilitator from the

state department chaired each session, and this was viewed by at least one participant as making continuity between sessions a problem.

For the most part, grievances, problems and concerns were aired at the workshop; and time was spent prioritizing statements about aspects of school life. The focus was on things that perhaps could not be changed about a given situation, but could be dealt with effectively. The workshop was open to aides, community members and administrators; but teachers were the primary target population.

Although no specific followup component was planned, the sessions were left open-ended in terms of duration, depending on the needs of the participants. Some specific spinoff building-level programs were cited by participants as coming directly from the workshop experience. For example, one school used an inservice day at the building to develop "first-day packets" to be administered to children who move from one school to another. These packets are to provide the child with immediate activities until the teacher and administrator have a chance to permanently place the child. This idea sprang out of the discussion regarding coordination of curriculum offerings and procedures for the three clustered schools.

PLANNING

The collective bargaining agreement between the Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO (now the exclusive representative of teachers in Carson), and the Carson School District stipulates that teachers and administrators of individual buildings shall jointly plan and participate in a certain number of staff development days. Any time beyond that may be planned by consultants and area or district personnel. In reality, most of the building level programs are planned and executed at that level with assistance from district resource teachers, curriculum specialists and human relations facilitators from the areas. District-wide offerings are planned by the trainers and program administrators in response to perceived teacher needs. The institutional racism project was to provide the basic "needs assessment" for the type of human relations staff development training to be provided, but there is no ongoing, formal needs assessment process. Based on

workshop evaluations and informal communications, and given the drastic budget constraints under which the district is presently operating, district-wide offerings are considered by trainers and administrators to be addressing teacher needs. Participant responses are mixed, but most participants saw some value in desegregation-related staff development training.

Carson is an administratively decentralized district, and each area is organized somewhat differently. The basic pattern for the planning and coordination of staff development programs involves the area superintendent, the area curriculum generalist, the area human relations facilitator, and various building level and area-wide committees composed of parents, teachers, administrators, resource teachers, in-district consultants and outside trainers. At the present time, the area human relations facilitator works with the human relations chairperson and staff development committee at each building to help develop and coordinate at least six hours of human relations-oriented staff development training each year at that building. The human relations facilitator works closely with the curriculum generalist, who handles the overall staff development budget for the area. Utilizing trained resource teachers and consultants, the emphasis is on integrating the curriculum multiethnically and incorporating the awareness and skills developed through human relations training into all aspects of staff development. A given building, through its staff development committee, submits proposals to the area office for funding. The human relations portion of the overall staff development budget is relatively small, ranging from three to five percent. Proposals for these funds must match the overall district guidelines for human relations, as well as the individual area goals.

IMPACTS/OUTCOMES

The primary outcomes of the desegregation-related inservice in Carson include the development and dissemination of multiethnic curriculum materials, as well as effective multiethnic/multicultural teaching strategies, and organizational processes and structures which are more open and responsive to teacher and community input as a result of district-wide training in communication skills. There is some

feeling among participants and administrators that desegregation-related efforts at the present time lack clear vision and direction. Underlying attitudes have not been impacted as directly as specific behaviors (e.g., language changes or the use of certain curriculum materials), according to respondents.

There is some feeling among respondents that desegregation may be a high concern, but a low priority, given the district's position vis-a-vis declining enrollment, building closures, eliminating teachers from the system and program reduction. Specific components of the district's desegregation inservice (e.g., the mandated sessions on communication skills and the institutional racism survey) received mixed reviews from respondents, with certain respondents feeling that these mandated programs engendered some hostility on the part of teachers.

Overall, the response indicated that participant involvement in and ownership of the programs offered is key. There is strong preference for the use of in-district expertise for staff development trainers, as opposed to reliance on outside consultants. The present desegregation-related training needs articulated include efforts to orient and sensitize those staffs newly involved in and impacted by desegregation, a need to integrate human relations training into the overall staff development program, and efforts to meet the morale and personal needs of the staff.

Edison School District
Midwest Region

Beth Osthimer

INTRODUCTION

Edison is an industrial center, with one large manufacturer supplying the major source of employment for the area. Unemployment levels are high, with a correspondingly high level of population mobility. Forty percent of the population receives some type of public assistance, and the city has a large concentration of low-income housing.

The population within the boundaries of Edison School District is close to 100,000, with a student enrollment of nearly 20,000 for the current school year. The racial composition of the student population is approximately 47 percent white, 45 percent black and 7 percent Hispanic. In addition, there are a number of "newly identified" American Indian students. The district has 28 elementary, 4 junior high and 2 high school buildings, all of which are involved in the district's desegregation plan.

BACKGROUND OF THE DESEGREGATION PLAN

During the late sixties, Edison shared with the rest of the country a measure of racial tension and strife. The state Civil Rights Commission conducted an inquiry into the status of race relations in Edison during this time, and reported that it was a city "divided by racial and ethnic prejudices and fears." In February 1969, a class action suit was filed in U.S. District Court against the school district. The suit charged that school officials were responsible for existing racial imbalance in the school system, including purposeful segregation in the assignment of administrative and teaching personnel. One year later, the District Court judge determined that the school district was guilty of de jure segregation. The judge ordered the district to submit a comprehensive desegregation plan.

The plan which was adopted called for the "clustering" of primarily white elementary schools from the north area with primarily black elementary schools from the south area. All elementary children continue

to be involved in the cross-district busing component of the plan. All pupils attend kindergarten in their neighborhood schools, and then attend either the neighborhood or "clustered" schools for grades 1, 2, and 3. The school is reversed in grades 4, 5, and 6. The junior highs are divided into east and west areas, with single-grade schools for 7th, 8th and, at one time, 9th grades established in each area. Almost all students are bused to these schools. In 1975-76, the 9th grade was incorporated into the high schools. The high schools are desegregated by open enrollment policies and boundary adjustments.

The Edison School Board filed a series of unsuccessful motions and appeals aimed at halting the Fall 1971 implementation of the mandated plan. The plan went into effect in September following incidents of violence involving the demolition of some school buses during the summer and accompanied by widespread, peaceful demonstrations and picketing during the first few weeks of school. The bombing of the buses was attributed to non-Edison based Ku Klux Klan activity, while the picketing and rallies were conducted by local community persons and outside participants. The overall success of the peaceful implementation of the plan was attributed by respondents to the low-keyed activities of a number of community groups, including the Edison Urban Coalition, a group of local clergy and, most importantly, members of the PTA Council and district administrative staff. In addition, by implementing a plan that involved all children equally in terms of number of years spent "busing" and "walking," some respondents felt that the district insured a measure of compliance. Although some white flight took place, both before and after implementation of the plan, the relative racial balance has stabilized over the last several years.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Prior to desegregation (Fall 1971), staff development in Edison School District was mandated for three days annually, just prior to the return of students to classes. In addition, subject-area consultants conducted inservice programs with staffs of individual schools. With the following few exceptions, the district did not begin desegregation-related inservice training until the funding of an ESAP proposal in September 1971.

In 1968, in apparent response to civil rights activity and racial tension both in Edison and in nearby metropolitan areas, the district mandated a two-day human-relations/sensitivity-type workshop for all staff. The meetings consisted of large group lectures on black minority concerns followed by small group discussions. It was felt by some respondents that this early experience with attitude-oriented training "left a bad taste in the mouth" of some participants, and was a factor in the district's decision to emphasize curriculum-based and achievement-oriented staff development training for desegregation, rather than more affective types of training.

Prior to Fall 1971, the assistant superintendent, who was in large part responsible for the formation and implementation of the district's desegregation plan, held weekly meetings with principals for general administrative purposes. For some of these meetings, principals were expected to come prepared to discuss portions of Thomas Pettigrew's work on desegregation in anticipation of the desegregation of Edison's schools.

During the 1970-71 school year, a human relations director was hired. He was responsible for publishing a monthly newsletter about the district and for establishing a speakers' bureau which identified desegregation experts, parents and students who were available to speak to community groups. When ESAP funds became available the following year, the human relations director and two addtional staff members became the ESAP staff.

The major thrust of the ESAP inservice training was workshops for non-certificated personnel. Custodial and food service personnel, secretaries, and bus drivers all participated in similarly structured two-day workshops. These meetings were conducted by an outside trainer and consultants from the DAC at a nearby university, in conjunction with central office administrators. Prior to the two-day sessions, held on consecutive Saturdays, there was an evening session to train group leaders to facilitate problem-solving discussions during the course of the workshop sessions. Individuals from the personnel groups targeted for training were selected to be trained as facilitators and were paid for the time spent in training, as well as the time spent in workshop sessions. These workshops were mandatory, and all participants were

paid for their attendance. The goals and objectives for the sessions were set by the administrator and trainer in charge; and the focus was on specific problem areas and strategies, rather than on sensitivity-type training. Overall response to the sessions was positive for all the groups involved in the training. In addition, criterion-reference tests were administered to participants to measure their growth in knowledge relating to specific district policies and procedures. The majority evidenced significant gains.

There was no certificated-staff training for desegregation under the ESAP grant, although some curriculum and management planning took place at the administrative level for the clustering of schools. The emphasis in the desegregation plan during the first year of implementation was on security and related matters. It was not until the funding acquired under ESAA in 1972 that desegregation-related staff development training for teachers began.

Under the ESAA grant, some teacher effectiveness training was conducted during 1972. The ESAA grant was quite large ($1.2 million in 1972, $2 million in 1973) and included several staff development components. The public relations component of the grant included community inservice to keep the public aware of the positive aspects of desegregation. The curriculum development component called for extensive inservice to upgrade the basic skills curriculum. By and large, human relations-type training "took a back seat" to curriculum-based and achievement expectations-related inservice.

The current goals of the ESAA program in Edison are to increase the achievement levels of all students and to decrease the gap between majority and minority students, not just through remediation but through a vigorous program of raising expectation levels. These goals serve as the overall desegregation goals of the district. Although ESAA's efforts are now concentrated at the secondary level, with Title I addressing the needs at the elementary level, developing and implementing a comprehensive sequential basic skills program for all grade levels has been the emphasis of the program. The mechanism for putting this goal into place is the district's instructional management system. This system "encourages and allows diagnosis and individualization while

maintaining multicultural, heterogeneous classrooms." With this program emphasis, ESAA staff trainers provide inservice in the skills required for teaching in heterogeneous classrooms. This year, specific district-wide workshops were held on the concepts of mastery learning, the techniques of eliminating ability grouping in the classroom, and cooperative learning techniques, in conjunction with the basic skills curriculum.

The ESAA staff offers several mini-conferences a year. Generally, they are topic-oriented, structured, and accommodate 30 to 60 participants. Teachers from grades 7 to 12 are usually the targeted population; but, occasionally, the conferences are open to all the district's teachers. One such district-wide mini-conference, held during the current school year, was geared towards improving student attitudes, achievement and attendance. Ninety teachers attended and each chose three 45-minute sessions from an offering of 27 topics. The conference was held after school for four hours and a stipend was given to those who volunteered to attend.

ESAA workshops follow a general format of review, overview, presentation, exercise and summary. The workshops are generally activity-oriented and provide materials for participants to take with them to their classrooms. Attendance is voluntary unless held during a staff development day at a particular school. Stipends are given to participants for attendance outside of regular school hours. Evaluations are always conducted and the results used in modifying future programs. The goals and objectives of each workshop are disseminated in fliers prior to the sessions.

Inservice provided through Title I is presently targeted at the elementary level. In addition to the activities conducted by the instructional leaders during staff development days at the buildings, Title I provides funds for buildings to arrange their own training, either after school, during an evening with dinner provided, or at any time that is convenient for the building staff. Presently, much of the training through Title I is centered around Brookhover, a method adopted by the School Board to make staffs aware of the importance of school climate and high expectations for student achievement. Any Title I workshops held outside of a designated building inservice day

are voluntary and pay a stipend for attendance. Title I also provides money to parents to conduct their own inservice in conjunction with the building instructional leaders and consultants. A recent trend in Title I workshops has been to hold joint parent-teacher workshops.

The district offers a state-funded remediation program in language arts and math. Resource teachers in every elementary building provide services to the students and, in addition, provide inservice for building staffs in remediation techniques for the classroom. There are no stipends for attendance, since the workshop sessions are held on an inservice day or, as is more frequently the case, the resource teacher works on an individual basis with teachers during the school day.

Edison engages the services of a desegregation institute at a nearby university. Funded under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this program seeks to increase student achievement by reducing and eliminating racism and sexism in schools. The program trains teams at each school to participate in the program and then, in turn, train their own staffs. Initial workshop sessions were conducted in the district during 1978-79, and the response of most participants was favorable.

The DAC at a nearby university has provided considerable assistance in desegregation-related staff development training for Edison. The DAC staff consultants were involved in working to train students in leadership skills as part of the ESAA effort to involve students in their own educational process. In addition, the DAC provided human relations training to staffs and administrators.

Edison has its own version of a program similar to Reverend Jesse Jackson's "Push for Excel." The superintendent formulated this program, and has carried it into every building in the district, in addition to introducing it during the district-wide meeting days held each year prior to the beginning of the school term. The emphasis is on raising achievement through raising expectations, and involving students, parents and teachers in "contract-like" agreements to promote this goal. This inservice program addresses attitudes, and does not provide specific programs (e.g., curriculum offerings). It is intended to serve as a boost to the morale of the entire educational community.

According to state law, a minimum requirement of 900 hours of classroom instruction must take place annually during the time allotted for school sessions. Under the teachers' association contract provisions, any time above that, and not specifically earmarked for parent-teacher conference days, can be targeted for staff development training at the building level. All staff are required to attend approximately three to four half-days each year. At the elementary level, workshops are often planned by the Title I instructional leader for the building or the state-funded resource teacher. The content of the sessions varies greatly, depending on building needs, and includes human-relations type training, building planning and coordination of basic skills curriculum with teaching strategies, or workshops on the newly-adopted Brookhover method, as it relates to classroom climate and the teaching of basic skills.

An administrative retreat is held each summer over a three-day weekend. This is considered the major planning session for the year. Reports are given on the status of various district programs and activities. The department of research and evaluation uses the opportunity to provide and explain the results of current research in the district. Presentations of current interest are given by district staff and outside consultants. School Board members frequently attend the retreat along with the central office and building administrators. Attendance is voluntary and room and board is generally provided by the district.

PLANNING OF INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Edison teachers, principals, administrators, trainers, community and students all participate to varying degrees in determining the in-service needs for the district. During the summer of 1971, several big workshops were held with teachers, community members and students in attendance. The goal of these workshops was to develop a comprehensive needs assessment for the ESAP proposal. The comments and suggestions offered at these meetings were also incorporated into the needs assessment component of the ESAA proposal. There is continuing input into the determination of building level needs from the site level curriculum councils composed of the principal, teachers, parents and students.

The structure for input has varied over the years; but presently district-wide personnel, including ESAA program directors and trainers, ask questions at the building level and work with staffs to develop appropriate staff development programs for building-identified needs. There is continuing, informal contact between those district personnel involved in providing inservice and staff coordinating councils at the building level. In addition, trainers and administrators work with a district-wide lay advisory committe to determine needs for community inservice.

With respect to the planning of inservice programs, the responsibility for developing and implementing specific offerings rests with ESAA program administrators and trainers, curriculum coordinators, Title I administrators, instructional leaders, resource teachers, district-wide curriculum consultants and outside consultants. In addition, the department of research and evaluation undertakes extensive data gathering in the areas of achievement, attitudes, and general program outcomes. The department then makes this information available to administrators, trainers, staffs and community to assist them in the planning process. District-wide offerings are, for the most part, planned and executed by program administrators and trainers. They solicit input in terms of suggestions from participants, modify future offerings based on workshop evaluations, and respond to individual requests for followup activities. Building site programs at the elementary level are often planned by the Title I instructional leader in Title I schools or the state-funded resource teacher in non-Title I schools, in conjunction with the staff coordinating council and the building principal.

There is some district-level coordination of staff development, with the ESAA administrator having a measure of administrative responsibility for most federally-funded programs. There are program administrators' meetings which afford district-level communication with respect to staff development offerings in these programs. In addition, in response to a perceived need for improved coordination of staff development programs, a staff development "liaison" was recently created for the elementary buildings involved in Title I. There is

no overall district program thrust or coordinated effort backed by hard dollars, as a corollary to the offerings of federally-funded programs.

IMPACTS AND OUTCOMES

The overall outcome of staff development training in Edison has been the increase in achievement levels of all students and the implementation of a sequential basic skills program of instruction in a desegregated context. Although the achievement gap between majority and minority students has not decreased since the beginning of desegregation, it has not increased. The thrust of most inservice training has been on impacting behaviors. There was a feeling on the part of some respondents that additional affective and attitudinal training is needed by many in the district.

The research and evaluation staff conducted attitude surveys for principals, teachers, community and students on the impacts of desegregation in the district. The survey of principals revealed that an overwhelming percentage said that there should have been more inservice preparation of staffs for desegregation. The specific areas targeted for future training by respondents included human relations training, classroom management, and methods for teaching children of different races and cultures. Teachers felt that many of their colleagues were not adequately equipped to teach in a multiracial/multiethnic classroom. Overall responses to the desegregation effort were positive, but discipline problems and concerns were noted by respondents.

The impacts of the inservice training in Edison can be seen in the actual implementation of programs and activities designed for a desegregated setting, greater community involvement in and concern for the schools, and at least a certain measure of acceptance of desegregation. Presently, some respondents feel a need to target inservice education to counter a natural tendency to "backslide," so that the move from desegregation to integration of the schools and community can continue.

Graham School District
Midwest Region

Rita Mahard

INTRODUCTION

Graham is a city of 136,000 covering a geographical area of 15 square miles. It is the largest city in the county, and is located in a heavily agricultural area. In addition to its political and agricultural importance, Graham is a major manufacturing and banking center of the state.

The Graham School District presently enrolls roughly 29,000 students. The great majority of the students are white (70 percent). Approximately twenty percent of the student population is black; most of the remaining nine percent are Hispanic.

Graham has forty-five elementary schools, five junior and four senior high schools. In addition, the district utilizes some services provided by the nearby state university.

DESEGREGATION BACKGROUND

The history of desegregation in Graham began in 1968. The School Board at that time resolved that all district schools with majority black enrollments should be closed by June 1971 and that affected students be bused to other facilities. In September 1969, the School Board pinpointed grades seven through twelve for desegregation. Attendance boundaries were redrawn and one inner-city junior high school was closed. These acts resulted in racial balance at the secondary level.

In March 1971 the School Board established two committees: the West Side Committee and the Citizens' Advisory Committee. The West Side Committee was directed to study existing inner-city elementary schools and make recommendations concerning their future operation (modification, closing, new construction, etc.). The Citizens' Advisory Committee was responsible for reviewing the desegregation plan then in effect at the secondary level and for studying the feasibility of desegregating the district's elementary schools.

Roughly a year later, the two committees reported their findings to the Board. In February 1972, the West Side Committee recommended that a 92 percent minority elementary school facility be closed, that a new structure be put up in the same general location, and that the new school be desegregated. In the April 1972 report to the Board, the Citizens' Advisory Committee recommended total desegregation of the district and presented three alternative desegregation plans. The committee also called for the adoption of district-wide employment practices which would further desegregation and involve all pupil-contact personnel in a "Human Awareness" educational program.

A citizens group favoring neighborhood schools was formed that same month. This group immediately announced its opposition to the three proposed desegregation plans and its intent to petition for the recall of pro-plan Board members.

Following six public hearings regarding the committees' recommendations, the School Board proposed a more limited plan based on school "clusters." Under the modified plan, two clusters (each containing four geographically contiguous schools) were formed by redrawing school attendance boundaries. All cluster schools operated grades K-2 on a neighborhood basis, while grades 3-4 and 5-6 were split between clusters. Affected schools were expected to achieve a minority enrollment between 10 and 45 percent. Staff positions within the clustered schools were filled on a voluntary basis. In June 1972, the School Board voted 5-3 in favor of the cluster plan, setting September 1972 as the implementation date.

By mid-July 1972, the citizen's group had obtained the requisite number of signatures to have the recall measures placed on the November ballot. Five of the nine Board members were recalled by 8 percent of the city's registered voters. They were replaced through a special election held in Mid-January 1973.

Early in February the Board rescinded the cluster plan and set Fall 1973 for the reinstatement of the K-6 neighborhood school system in the 8 cluster schools. In addition, the Board voted for a revision of the district's policy on equal educational opportunity. It was also decided to proceed with plans for the construction of the new

elementary school that was to replace the one which was closed.

In August 1973, in response to a motion filed by the NAACP several months earlier, a Federal District Court judge ordered the Board to continue with the cluster plan. Following a two-week teacher strike, school opened in mid-September. Five new schools joined the original eight in the cluster operation, bringing 13 of the district's 46 elementary schools into racial balance.

Phase III of the desegregation plan began in September 1974. As stipulated in the June 1972 plan, Phase III was to consist of an evaluation of the cluster program. A public opinion survey, an ethnic survey and a student achievement evaluation were conducted.

In October 1975, the Board voted against desegregation of the remaining segregated elementary schools and developed a desegregation plan for the new school. This plan was rejected by the court. After hearing a Board member's testimony that the new school would operate as a neighborhood school, a Federal District Court judge ordered that construction of the new building be halted. When an outside expert determined that forced busing would be necessary in order to desegregate the new school, the injunction was lifted and construction of the facility continued.

Final arguments were delivered in November 1975. One month later, the judge ruled that the Graham Board of Education had "created and maintained a segregated dual school system...." He ordered a desegregation plan that would "end racial isolation throughout the school system." The Board voted 6-2 to appeal the decision. The Appellate Court upheld the judge's decision; and in December 1977, the Supreme Court declined to hear the Board's appeal.

In May 1976, the judge ordered the implementation of the NAACP-drawn plan for the 1976-77 school year. At the same time, he requested that the Community Relations Services of the U.S. Department of Justice assist the district in achieving orderly implementation. In September 1976, the new school went into operation as a K, 5, 6 cluster school.

In February 1978, the Circuit Court upheld a lower court decision regarding the Board's appeal of the May 1976 order which expanded the cluster plan from 13 to 20 elementary schools. The Board voted 5-4

to petition the Supreme Court for a review of that decision. The case is still pending.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The master agreement between the Graham Education Association (GEA) and the Graham Board of Education stipulates that "the staff of each school building shall be required to spend a maximum of seventeen hours per school year" in inservice activities. The lack of a minimum requirement is associated with a great deal of variation in the amount of building-based inservice. Some schools routinely undertake more than the seventeen hours on a voluntary basis; most schools engage in an average of 9-10 hours of building-based inservice each year. In addition to the seventeen hours, teachers are required to accrue four professional growth points (PGP) every four years as a condition for advancement on the salary scale. PGP credit can be accrued in a variety of ways; the only stipulation is that inservice which involves stipends and/or released time does not count toward the requirement.

The district's major funding for inservice comes from two federal programs: a $550,000 ESAA Special Projects Grant which has a large inservice component and a $100,000 Title I, Part B ESEA grant which is devoted entirely to inservice. Several other federal and state programs have much smaller inservice components.

Approximately $30,000 of the district's general funds are set aside yearly for inservice. These funds are administered by the Joint Inservice Committee (JIC), a group made up of representatives from the support, teaching and administrative staffs. The JIC meets four times yearly to generate ideas for inservice and to judge applications for funds by the individual schools.

Most of the district's inservice offerings are coordinated by the Instructional Development Team (IDT). IDT members are often teachers on special assignment--they apply for IDT duty and are selected by central administrators.

Inservice training in Graham is usually provided in one of two ways: the IDT will be asked for help by an individual teacher or by the school staff and subsequent training will be offered, or an IDT

member will put together a training session and offer it to anyone who is interested. Inservice in Graham seems to be split about evenly between IDT-initiated and school staff-requested activities. Training events are advertised throughout the district in the weekly inservice calendar. IDT members usually establish an enrollment ceiling, with slots filled on a first-come, first-served basis. If demand is sufficiently high, the inservice will be offered until demand has been met.

Evaluation of the training by participants is usually relatively informal. Brief, open-ended questionnaires are common. Results are tabulated and analyzed by the IDT, and recommendations are used to plan future offerings.

The district relies primarily on its own experts to provide training. Outside consultants are occasionally utilized, but seem generally to be viewed as less satisfactory. The director of development seemed to feel that "inside" trainers were better received by teachers.

In general, the inservice activities that currently take place in Graham are not seen as desegregation-related. Most respondents viewed desegregation-related inservice as those training activities that took place in the wake of the 1972 board-adopted cluster plan. Members of the Instructional Development Team share this perception. The head of the team pointed out that inservice activities apply to non-cluster as well as cluster schools and, while participants tend to teach mainly in cluster schools, there is no specific relationship between desegregation and inservice. One striking exception to this view is held by the director of staff development. This individual, who has held his post since the district's earliest involvement with desegregation, spoke of a "conscious decision to avoid labeling inservice as desegregation-related." He felt that to do otherwise would cause problems with teacher attendance.

Early Desegregation Training

The Graham School District received training assistance for desegregation from a nearby Desegregation Assistance Center (DAC) from

roughly 1971-73. The service offered by the DAC was an analysis of district policies related to equal educational opportunity. DAC staff used district data in two ways: to determine whether district policies were prima facie segregative and, in the event that they were not, to determine whether district policies were implemented in a discriminatory fashion.

The DAC effort in Graham had three components: a needs assessment, the provision of inservice responding to identified needs and the dissemination of resources to the district. The process is seen as effective by DAC staff because it allowed district personnel to attribute district equal educational opportunity shortcomings to prior district policies. This is seen by DAC staff as an important first-order of business which allowed district officials to move ahead in establishing equal educational opportunity for students.

In the summer of 1971, DAC staff at the state university conducted a conference on the multiethnic curriculum for selected Graham staff. This introduced some staff members to the services available at the DAC. Staff returned to the district, shared the information they had received and then requested an on-site program.

In January 1972, the superintendent arranged for DAC staff to work with the district's desegregation advisor in training school board members and administrators. The program began with a presentation by a state education official who "laid on the mantle of approval." This was followed by a lecture on the legal basis of desegregation delivered by a lawyer. The initial session concluded with questions and answers.

The remaining two days were spent using district data (gathered by DAC staff) to examine district policies affecting student assignment and classification, facilities and resource allocation. Groups were organized by role for both the analysis and the recommendations concerning how district policies might be modified to reinforce desegregation.

DAC staff seem to feel that the recommendations that came out of this service activity did have some influence on later board activity. The modified plan and subsequent board recall occurred during this same time, however; so it is difficult to comment with any

specificity on what policies were affected by this inservice or on what might have happened if the training had not occurred.

Examples of Current Inservice Offerings

The Classroom Management workshop is a regular district offering. Participants meet after school for 18 two-hour sessions. The program is offered by an IDT member with extensive previous experience as a classroom teacher. The workshop is funded under the district's Title I funds. Elementary school teachers are the primary target group. While attendance is voluntary, both the workshop leader and those participants interviewed felt that attendance was positively influenced by the stipend offered. (There is an option for college credit, but participants must attend for 72 hours rather than 36.)

Each session is school-site based, and normally starts off with a 20-minute presentation by the IDT leader. The presentation is followed by a group discussion, various role-playing activities and some pencil-and-paper exercises. Between sessions, participants are expected to practice one specific skill in the classroom and report back to the group at the following session.

An Individualized Instruction workshop was cited as especially effective by a number of respondents. This particular program was a county-wide offering hosted by an intermediate district. Intermediate district employees with classroom experience provided the training. Attendance was voluntary, with substitutes provided for participants by their home district.

The Effective Use of Teacher Aides workshop was offered by the district's Instructional Development Team. Twenty-eight participants (evenly split between teachers and their aides) met for four hours on a voluntary basis. Workshop pay and a dinner served as incentives.

During the session, each teacher/aide team listed six problems they felt existed in their classroom. They then negotiated which three problems were the most critical and, finally, presented one of the three to the larger group. The fourteen teams then discussed possible solutions to the problems which had been presented.

An unstandardized questionnaire was used to provide data on

participant reaction to the training. Data were analyzed by the IDT trainer and used to plan subsequent sessions. Followup consisted of informal conversations between trainer and participants at various times during the school year. A more formalized followup mechanism was seen as desirable by both trainer and participants.

PLANNING AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Traditionally, participant involvement in inservice needs assessment and planning has been both limited and informal. Generally, IDT members develop workshops and structure offerings in response to perceived teacher needs. These needs are not formally assessed, but are informally determined based on conversation and expressed teacher interests. Although the participants in a given workshop may act to modify its content during the course of a session, IDT members have been responsible for the initial determination of offerings and the actual planning of workshops.

The current trend may be towards a broader, more formalized process. A recent experiment along these lines has aroused considerable interest and enthusiasm. As a prototype of the kind of activity that trainers and participants expect to rely upon in the future, the experiment merits attention.

The experiment is a response to what one IDT member characterized as a growing realization that teachers typically identify training interests, not training needs. This workshop is designed to help sixteen teachers develop needs assessment and planning skills. Participants meet on a voluntary basis every two weeks for two hours. The training is provided by the ESEA Title I office and participants receive workshop pay for attending. Initially each teacher was asked to identify on paper the high and low points of her average teaching day and to offer some explanation as to why she had chosen those particular points. Each participant then kept a daily activities log along with notes about her general frame of mind during those activities. At a second session, participants analyzed the previously identified high and low points in the context provided by the activities logs. A group discussion followed individual analyses.

Many respondents found that the things they thought were bothering them were merely symptomatic of deeper issues. One teacher provided a rather dramatic illustration of this point. She had identified late afternoon as her most frustrating time of the day. When she examined her daily log, she found out that she spent a large portion of each afternoon disciplining the same student. This respondent concluded that the student in question was serving as her scapegoat. She chose to discuss her findings and feelings with the group and, jointly, they came up with a number of strategies to correct the situation.

Several respondents mentioned the above incident. Most were favorably impressed with this example of the effectiveness of collecting and interpreting data from their own classrooms. All felt that this new needs assessment/planning procedure had helped them to become more aware of their classroom behavior. While the workshop is still in the experimental stage, the format is expected to influence future in-service offerings.

IMPACT OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Programs which were considered valuable by participants and trainers alike had several common elements. Training was heavily practical and resulted in skills which could be put to immediate use in the classroom; trainers were in-district employees or, if out-of-district trainers, had taken the time to carefully research the local scene; trainers had previous classroom experience; and training required a fairly high level of personal interaction. Virtually every program we encountered in Graham was voluntary and there was overwhelming agreement that voluntary programs are preferable to mandatory programs. In the words of one central office employee, "Teachers find mandated inservice demeaning."

Elements of specific programs were mentioned by respondents as having been effective. The workshop on the effective use of teacher aides was cited as one that improved communication and led to more efficient and satisfactory working relationships between teachers and aides within the classroom. The workshop on classroom management resulted in the development of a peer-support group among teachers.

The workshop dealing with individualized instruction was viewed as effective for a number of reasons. Most often mentioned was the fact that format and content were so well matched. The majority of participants taught in a traditional, highly structured classroom setting; the initial day of the workshop focused on highly-structured exercises aimed at the entire group. Techniques for individualization were introduced gradually and, by the third day, the entire "curriculum" of the workshop was individualized. The heavy emphasis on practical, transportable skills, the high degree of organization of the material and the charisma of the leaders were also frequently mentioned as having positively contributed to the workshop's effectiveness.

While no formal followup mechanism was employed, a materials room was set up in the intermediate district with staff available for follow-up activities on an individual request basis. Respondents spoke with enthusiasm about the workshop and seemed to feel that their own classrooms were considerably more individualized as a result of the training.

When questioned about what would make inservice programs more effective, virtually everyone mentioned more money. Funds to develop materials, to provide substitutes and to cover teacher stipends were seen by many respondents as affecting probable success of inservice activities.

A lack of followup was mentioned almost as often as a lack of money. Many respondents felt that immediate, comprehensive followup should be part of all inservice activities. Said one principal, "They [trainers] shouldn't wait to be asked. No one will ask."

One IDT member cited a need to integrate previous training--"We've done so much at this point that teachers and aides need to learn how to incorporate skills into their daily job patterns."

Harris School District
Midwest Region

Maureen Carney

INTRODUCTION

The Harris School District (HSD) is composed of several suburban communities and is part of a large metropolitan area. The district is largely residential with single family dwellings ranging in value from $15,000 to approximately $100,000. There are several major industrial plants within the community which employ a large percentage of the residents.

HSD has a student enrollment of 17,000 in 21 elementary schools, four junior highs, and three senior highs. The minority student enrollment is approaching 25 percent. Of the nearly 2,000 district employees, about 5 percent are administrators, 55 percent are teachers, and 40 percent are noncertified personnel. The percentage of minority staff approximates 12 percent in each category.

DESEGREGATION BACKGROUND

Desegregation of the Harris School District was accomplished under court order with the annexation of two small districts, Belmont and Hilliard, by the larger Harris District. The administrative consolidation was implemented in the fall of 1975, with the desegregation plan to be implemented in the fall of 1976.

The Belmont District included 1,000 students, all black, in four schools. Hilliard District had 4,250 students, 43 percent black, in eight schools. To join these two would have created a district with a 50-60 percent black enrollment. Nearby Harris District had 16,500 students, 5 percent non-white, in 22 schools. Of the various desegregation plans submitted to the court, the annexation of the Belmont and Hilliard School Districts by the Harris School District was considered to be "the least disruptive alternative which is educationally sound, administratively feasible, and which promises to achieve at least the minimum

amount of desegregation that is constitutionally required" (U.S. District Court, January 1975).

All three districts opposed the annexation plan and gave arguments in court to prevent it. People from the Harris District did not see why they should be involved in rectifying a situation which they did not create. Residents of Belmont were fearful of losing their identity when their district was dissolved, their schools closed, and their children bused in small groups to other areas. The Harris tax levy, at the rate of $5.38 per hundred dollars of assessed valuation, was to be uniformly applied to the annexed districts. This was a large tax increase for Hilliard and some increase for Belmont, previously taxed at the rates of $3.80 and $4.97 respectively.

Once the court order was handed down there was not much community resistance. District and community leaders held small meetings at each school and asked for acceptance of the plan. No one asked for approval of the plan. Fear of the unknown was alleviated by disseminating information on exactly what would happen to each child. Emphasis was placed on assuring parents that the change would not affect the educational plan or the stability of the area.

Basically, the desegregation plan was set up to equalize the racial balance of all the schools in the newly consolidated district. In its first year of implementation, all of the Belmont schools were closed and the students reassigned to those schools which had the fewest minority students. The Hilliard K-6 schools were paired with neighboring Harris K-6 schools to form either K-4 or 5-6 schools. Each subsequent year boundaries were readjusted in an effort to keep the minority enrollment of each school between 21 and 45 percent. By 1978, 16 of the 21 elementary schools had met this goal, with 4 schools somewhat higher (up to 54 percent) and one school lower (less than 20 percent).

There were many administrative problems to settle in the annexation plan. The three different pay schedules for teachers and other district staff needed to be worked out equitably. The repositioning of central office administrators from the two annexed districts,

student and staff reassignment, adequate transportation of students, and effective communication channels throughout the newly formed district were critical items to consider. To achieve an orderly transition, "task forces" made up of community residents, educational staff and students were set up to survey opinions and to determine the educational goals of students, educators and neighborhood residents who would be served by the consolidated district. A total of 204 people participated as task force members and came to a consensus regarding first order priorities. In addition, recommendations were set down in the form of tasks to be carried out in working towards each of the stated goals. All task force activities were conducted by a private research evaluation firm in cooperation with the expanded district's administration, principals and School Board. All task force activities were supported by contract from the regional Title IV funded Desegregation Assistance Center.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Staff development is a high priority in the HSD. This was true for many years before the desegregation plan went into effect. For as long as those interviewed could remember, there was an early dismissal day each month for the purpose of staff training. In July 1975, a director of staff development was hired and a Teacher Center program was started. During the first year of its operation, the Center offered programs for the schools which were not involved in the desegregation plan while those which were involved worked with district administrators to prepare for the plan's implementation.

At the present time, all inservice activities, with the exception of the Title I program, are coordinated through the Teacher Center director. The stated staff development goals are: 1) to insure continuous educational program development and renewal; and 2) to provide an individualized self-improvement program specifically designed for each teacher. Programs are based on a thorough needs assessment that includes working with each school and then with teachers individually.

Well over a million dollars a year is spent on inservice in the form of stipends to participants, substitute teachers, trainers' fees,

Teacher Center facilities and staff, and materials and supplies. Besides the district money utilized for inservice, there is federal funding under ESEA Titles I and IVC and ESAA; state funding under Gifted and Talented; and grants from a private foundation.

Though most of the staff development programs are planned for teachers, there are special programs for administrators, principals, noncertified staff, community residents and students. Participation is voluntary but highly encouraged. Either released time or stipends are granted to those who attend.

Inservice Programs of Orientation to Desegregation

A state-mandated inservice program dealing with drug abuse education was held in 1971. The two-day workshop was mandatory for all district staff and stipends were given to participants. Outside consultants were engaged and the program format was one of presentation and small group activity, such as role playing or problem solving. Since the content of the two days dealt with values clarification and cultural awareness, participants considered it to be a good preparation for the desegregation of the district. CRA Title IV and district monies supported this program.

Beginning in the Spring of 1975 and extending to the Spring of 1977, inservice programs and workshops designed to treat all aspects of the desegregation process were offered to all levels of district staff, Board members, members of the Biracial Advisory Committee, students and community residents. They included training programs on techniques for analyzing the educational needs of students, cultural bias in testing, examining instructional materials for ethnic and racial stereotyping, effective teaching methods in an integrated classroom, understanding the nature of racial prejudice, and human relations and communications training.

The district's Report to the Court (1976, 1977) indicates that during the first six months of the 1975-76 school year a total of 18 informational meetings and workshops directly related to the district's desegregation plan were conducted for nearly 500 district staff members. During the following eight months, 89 separate

workshops either directly or indirectly related to the district's desegregation plan were conducted for nearly 2,000 participants. Trainers were chosen from among district staff or outside consultants. Funding for these programs came from district revenues, CRA Title IV, and from a private foundation. During the remainder of the 1976-77 school year, other workshops and training programs relating to the desegregation process were conducted by the staff of a newly funded ESAA project working in conjunction with the district's regular inservice training staff.

Of the many desegregation preparation programs which the district offered, two stand out clearly in the minds of participants. They were held during the faculty orientation week just prior to the first day of busing and were attended by all district staff. Both were conducted by black, male, out-of-district trainers; both dealt with cultural differences; and both were half-day programs with a format of lecture followed by questions and answers.

The Teacher Center Programs

Since its beginning in 1975, the Teacher Center has offered or coordinated more than 400 inservice programs. The general inservice goals of the Center are the same as those of the district (mentioned above). Specific goals are determined yearly by assessing school, community, and individual needs factors. The sessions vary in both content and format. Generally, the Center summarizes the content areas for teacher programs with the following divisions: curriculum planning, curriculum delivery methods, evaluation techniques, human skills, classroom management, and other. Each year 1/3 to 1/2 of the program offerings have been curriculum planning. The format for the programs may be workshop, seminar, university class, participant exchange, or individual consultation; and the duration may range from one hour to several days. Trainers may be internal staff or outside consultants. Program offerings for administrators and noncertified staff are as varied in content and format as are those for teachers.

The Teacher Center began as an ESEA Title IVC project and operated with these and district funds for three years. When ESAA Title VII funds became available to the district, it was possible to coordinate the inservice offerings of that project with those of the Teacher Center by utilizing the Title VII funding for eligible participants and programs.

HSD has been affiliated with the /I/D/E/A/ program of the Kettering Foundation for a period of eight years. The basic aim of this program is to establish a school-site structured process for achieving faculty consensus on the school's goal, needs and programs. Five schools in the district have embraced this program and are known as IGE (Individually Guided Education) schools. District administrators would like to have this program in all elementary schools, but only if the staff chooses it voluntarily.

The staff of each IGE school attended (as a team) 4 1/2 weeks of preparation during the summer prior to their school's participation in the program. The first three days were spent getting acquainted with the program. Then followed two weeks of summer school teaching in the morning and planning in the afternoons. The last two weeks were used to establish needs and programs for their own school. The Teacher Center staff served as trainers and continue to assist these schools to maintain the IGE program. As an incentive for participation in the training, teachers were given stipends and noncertified personnel received compensatory time.

Title I Programs

The inservice component of the district's Title I program offers staff training in dealing with basic skills remediation, affective development and social growth. Workshops are held at the end of the school day with the 38 Title I teachers and instructional aides attending jointly. The monthly meetings generally last from 1 to 1 1/2 hours with a format of presentation and discussion. Trainers may be outside consultants or district staff.

There is a cooperative relationship between Title I personnel and the Teacher Center staff. The assistance of the Teacher Center

director is utilized in the selection of training programs to meet the specific needs of this group of participants and Title I staff participate in the ongoing district inservice programs offered through the Teacher Center. However, no Title I funds are used to support Teacher Center activities.

PLANNING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

The district's staff development program is operated through the superintendent as authorized by the district Board of Education. The principal responsibility for program coordination and implementation is delegated to a director of staff development who is also the director of the Teacher Center. An 11-member Steering Committee, seven of whom are teachers, functions as a policymaking and advisory group for the Teacher Center.

The Teacher Center is the focal point of inservice activity and its program offerings are the results of systematic need determination and of continual program evaluation. Each school has an organized Needs Committee consisting of the principal and one teacher member for every 10 teachers. Prior to the beginning of school each fall, the building Needs Committees meet for a 2-day Data Base Workshop to learn the Teacher Center process and ways of analyzing data pertinent to their schools. From this procedure each committee reaches consensus on goals for its building. Just before school begins, the committee plans and conducts a 2 1/2 hour Building Needs Assessment Workshop with the entire staff of its school.

At the Building Needs Assessment Workshop the teachers are surveyed using a teacher skill/interest questionnaire to determine knowledge levels and inservice needs in 56 specified areas. The Teacher Center staff compiles building profiles on priorities and runs computer analyses on questionnaire data for all teachers. These analyses determine the number of teachers requesting training in each skill as well as the priorities set by each teacher.

Inservice programs are designed by the Teacher Center staff utilizing input from questionnaires, Needs Committees, and other sources. Teachers indicating interest in a specified area are invited

to attend the inservice workshops offered in that area. Others can attend as space permits.

At the conclusion of each inservice program, participants are asked to fill out a written evaluation. The Teacher Center staff compiles and analyzes the evaluation results. In general, a follow-up session of an hour or more is held where participants may review, clarify or expand on the inservice. After six weeks, teachers are asked to provide specific examples of their application of the activities gained from the inservice program that have become part of their teaching.

Targeted inservice programs are evaluated to demonstrate increases in knowledge, in observed skills and perceived abilities. This is done by pre- and post-testing and/or with the use of control group comparisons.

The evaluation analyses are shared with the instructor of each program. They are also utilized to plan additional inservice, to make appropriate changes, and to provide program monitoring.

The planning of development programs for administrators follows a similar pattern as that described for teachers. A different instrument is used to assess the needs of administrators and program planning and selection are based on the results. As is the case for teachers' programs, evaluation of each administrative program offering is done in writing and the responses utilized by the Teacher Center staff for future planning.

IMPACT/OUTCOMES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The inservice programs of orientation to the desegregation plan accomplished the goal of a trouble-free transition from three separate school districts (two of which were highly segregated) to one desegregated district. There were no models of similar annexations available, but the district administrators made use of available consultants. Most helpful in this transition period was the staff of the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice. According to one top administrator, they were "competent to a man," knew the problems which were "down the road," and recommended the people who could best assist.

Least helpful was the Desegregation Assistance Center staff which, in the opinion of some, "took up a lot of time and presented mostly negative learning."

The district's efforts to provide inservice training in human relations and cultural awareness prior to desegregating the district were mildly successful. The two programs remembered by most participants met with mixed reactions, some strongly positive and others strongly negative regarding the practical value of the information presented.

With the start of the Teacher Center, efforts were made to objectively evaluate the impact of the staff development programs. Records were kept on attendance, overall evaluation ratings of nearly 400 programs, and a series of studies of the effectiveness of 22 separate programs utilizing pre-post testing and/or control group designs.

During the 1977-78 school year, for example, there were 2,200 participants at nearly 100 programs, 865 different teachers attending one or more. Since all program attendance is voluntary, the number of participants would seem to indicate that either the incentive (stipend or released time) or the programs themselves were viewed as worthwhile.

From the 15-item participant evaluations of the individual programs offered through the Teacher Center between 1975 and 1979, an overall rating is reported for each on a scale of 1.0 to 5.0 (5.0 being high). Only one of nearly 400 programs received an overall rating of less than 3.0; over half were rated between 4.0 and 5.0.

The Teacher Center staff working with the staff of an evaluation research firm gathered evidence of effectiveness in 22 studies of the impact of inservice on teacher skill/knowledge. Seven studies evaluated teacher achievement and/or attitude gains resulting from inservice; three studies evaluated behavioral changes; and twelve studies dealt with perceived gains in skill and knowledge. Nineteen of the 22 studies (2 are incomplete to date) revealed positive gains, significant at the .05 level. No one study resulted in overwhelming evidence for effectiveness; however, the results were consistently positive and indicate a trend of small but steady gains as a result of participation in Teacher Center activities.

Inservice programs having a desegregation-related impact are difficult to distinguish from the total inservice program in the district. Many of the workshops dealing with curriculum development were necessary and came about because of the restructuring of the district's schools. The formation of and interest in the IGE schools coincided with the implementation of the desegregation plan. However, other than the desegregation orientation inservice of 1975-77, there seems to be very little awareness of a need for inservice that addresses itself to cultural or ethnic issues. Throughout the many interviews that were conducted with teachers, both white and black, there was a noticeable lack of interest in multicultural education.

Certainly, the program offerings of the district are directly related to the expressed needs of the employees, and most of the participants interviewed felt that the district's inservice programs met their needs. A few respondents would prefer that fewer programs of longer duration be planned as an alternative to many one-shot sessions. As it is now, the number of program offerings limits the possibility of extensive followup for each program. The overall positive attitude towards the quality of the staff development programs that is expressed by administrators and teachers may be the best indicator of effectiveness.

Milner School District
Midwest Region

Evelyn M. Davila

INTRODUCTION

Milner, a suburban community of 36,000 people, is located approximately twenty minutes from a large metropolitan area. The initial development was controlled by strict zoning laws and detailed planning. Only certain specified styles of architecture were considered acceptable and approval of house designs was required before construction could begin. This strict control on where and how houses, streets, and parks were to be built also included a provision which effectively kept the city segregated. In order to purchase a plot of land and build a house, a person had to have written approval from his immediate neighbors.

This provision served as an effective integration barrier until approximately twenty years ago when the first black family moved into the area. Though the land they bought was considered part of Milner, the boundaries covered by the provision did not include that area.

Today, with a student population of 6,245, the racial composition of the Milner School District is approximately two-thirds white and one-third black. All those interviewed on site, whether black or white, shared an intense feeling of pride in their community and an interest in school-related matters. As an example of the community's commitment to its schools, it was pointed out that all bond issues have been approved by the voters through the years.

The community is an affluent one with an average family income of over $26,000. Houses range in price from about $25,000 to $250,000 and all are set on attractive streets within a park-like setting.

The community is very school-oriented. Its residential areas are designated by the elementary school names within that area. There are nine elementary schools, two junior high schools, and a centrally located senior high school. Per pupil expenditure is $2,086 with 83 percent of the schools operating budget provided by local real estate taxes.

The district's professional staff of 470 consists of 89 percent white and 11 percent non-white members. Approximately two-thirds of

the 357 classroom teachers have Master's degrees, and the average teacher's salary is $17,507. The faculty is very stable; what mobility there is occurs within the district. Teachers and principals are interchangeably assigned to different schools with the purpose of fostering the sentiment that they work for the district, not for a particular school.

DESEGREGATION BACKGROUND

The Milner Desegregation Plan was implemented in September 1970 after the School Board approved it as an experimental project. It was a voluntary plan originally designed to desegregate the one predominantly black (88 percent) elementary school (K-6) and to promote integration in six predominantly white elementary schools without requiring transfers or redistricting. The plan was and is based entirely on voluntary cross enrollment of both black and white children between neighborhood schools. Under the plan, any student may transfer to another school if the transfer will improve the racial balance. The desegregation plan was adopted as a permanent program in 1973 and expanded in 1977 to include the remaining two elementary schools and both junior highs (7-8). The one senior high school automatically reflects the district-wide racial balance. At the present time, all 12 schools in the district are desegregated.

The community was actively involved in the desegregation planning before a plan was approved by the School Board. Continual meetings were held with parents to assure understanding of the plan during the year preceding it. At present 482 students, 285 black and 197 white, have voluntarily transferred schools.

Since July 1975, the desegregation plan has been administered by an office devoted entirely to its needs, which is funded by an ESAA grant. During the present school year, 1978-79, it received its fourth consecutive grant award, for the sum of $341,000.

The ESAA office staff is basically responsible for attracting students to the program, arranging their transportation, and supervising the adjustment of the students by handling whatever problems arise as a

result of their enrollment in the program. In addition, they counsel parents, work actively to assure the community's continuous acceptance of the program, and offer inservice programs for the district staff and the community.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The district describes all of the inservice programs held since September 1975 as desegregation-related and supports the programs with ESAA funds. The director of the desegregation plan and the staff development coordinator for the district cooperated in developing a professional development series.

There were four general objectives for the series. These were: (1) to explain the desegregation plan to every employee of the school district in order that all staff would have information about the plan, the schools involved, and the ESAA grant; (2) to implement a program designed to explain cultural differences within life-styles and learning styles in order that teachers in the district would have exposure and the opportunity to react to current practices and attitudes in interpersonal/interracial matters; (3) to provide experiences between teachers and students that would facilitate positive interpersonal relationships; and (4) to implement cognitive programs which recognized, acknowledged, and provided alternative educational strategies for various learning styles.

A variety of activities were planned to implement these objectives. During the first year, guest consultants offered seminars and workshops for the district's staff. Some of the areas covered were: humanizing the schools without losing academic excellence, non-verbal communication, affective learning, social learning, conflict resolution, and personalized learning. The first two were seminars; the rest were workshops of three sessions each.

The seminars were offered on Saturday mornings, and the workshops were held either immediately after school hours, in the evenings or on Saturday mornings. Each participant was paid a stipend. Invitations for participation were extended to the private and parochial schools in the district as well as to all district staff.

For the 1976-77 school year, the major goal of the ESAA inservice program was to coordinate the school building needs with the welfare of the minority student and with general interpersonal understanding. The school staff at each of the buildings selected a committee to work with the ESAA staff assistant for professional development. The grant money allocated for the year did not allow for the payment of stipends. Therefore, the majority of programs were planned for periods when teachers were in school in order to avoid conflict with the district's collective bargaining.

The activities were organized according to the expressed needs of each building. Two elementary schools chose programs that were considered to be of a broad enough scope to benefit all teachers. These programs, entitled "Problems Peculiar to Integrated Schools" and "Diagnostic Teaching," were offered as seminars to all elementary teachers. Guest consultants offered the 5-session seminars after school over a period of five weeks.

In addition to the building activities, two other district-wide activities were held. A Saturday morning workshop was held during which an invited learning center coordinator presented ideas and sample materials that could be used to stimulate and maintain students' interest in learning. An estimated 120 teachers attended this session. District funds were used to pay teachers' expenses.

An on-site credit course, "Teaching Children to Reason," was offered through the state university for full graduate credit of 3 quarter hours. The participant paid one-third of the tuition ($29.00) for this course. The majority of the teachers who took part were from the staff of what was considered to be the most racially impacted school in the district.

In the fall of 1977, with the direction of a new superintendent, a review was made of the progress of race relations in the district. A consensus was reached that, though progress had been made, there was still evidence of "institutional racism" within the district. A Professional Development Day was planned for the beginning of the school year for the total staff and administration. The objective of this district-wide workshop was to develop specific projects, programs,

and strategies that would help to overcome institutional racism in the district's school system.

Consultants in the field of institutional racism were invited and helped in the planning of the workshop. The consultants met with the Professional Development Committee prior to the workshop with the purpose of better understanding the district's concern and the total community.

The format consisted of a presentation by the consultant on racism and how it manifests itself in school systems. This was offered to an audience of approximately 470. The staff was then divided into working groups of approximately twenty-two with an in-district trainer assigned to each group. The task of the group was to identify system-wide indicators of racism and develop individual school-related projects that would help to overcome racism in the school. A time line for implementing these projects was requested from each group. The role of the group trainer was to facilitate and assist in maintaining the focus on the task.

It was expected that each building would be responsible for the implementation of its individual plan under the leadership of the principal who would report to the superintendent. To assure followup to the district-wide workshop, after-school discussions were held between the principal and his staff at each individual school. Each school had a showing of the film "From Racism to Pluralism," followed by a discussion. Due to the special emphasis placed by the superintendent on this topic of institutional racism, year-long school activities were organized around it.

The continuous and strong emphasis on desegregation-related inservice has led to what many in the district consider a saturation of the topic. Though the central staff views all inservice as desegregation-related, this year's program shied away from using the desegregation theme in their objectives. The main focus of this year's inservice program has been on curriculum development as requested by the staff needs assessment. Programs relating to teachers liability, creativity and problem-solving, language arts teaching techniques, career development, great books, and reading skills have been offered

during the school day and teachers were given release time to attend. Some of the teachers interviewed felt that these topics were desegregation-related since, in the broadest sense, their "professional growth assures quality education for all children."

One of the most effective workshops offered this year, in the view of many of the teachers interviewed, was the "Great Books Training" workshop. The goal of this workshop was to help teachers become more effective in leading group discussions with their students on the students' interpretation of written work. It was offered by a private organization and was open to all teachers. Expenses for the participants were covered by district funds. Forty teachers (full capacity) participated in this 10 hour workshop. It was described as a demonstration workshop, and all were required to demonstrate the skills and techniques being discussed. An evaluation form was given to the participants at the end of the session by the inservice committee responsible for the planning of the program. Many of the teachers interviewed expressed the need for a followup session, which, to date, has not been offered or planned.

A "Language Arts" workshop was offered at one of the elementary schools. This was a building level workshop offered for the fifth grade teachers on language arts techniques to be used in the classroom. It was offered by one of the schools' sixth grade teachers on three consecutive Monday evenings. All of the fifth grade teachers attended on a voluntary basis. Specific skills and techniques were discussed and demonstrated. As with the district-wide workshop, this inservice program did not have a formal followup session; but because of the proximity and continuous interaction between the teachers, informal followup discussions occur when needed.

PLANNING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES--AN OVERVIEW

Primary responsibility for the planning of inservice activities has been with the director of the desegregation plan, the staff development coordinator and a committee composed of a teacher representative from each building and central office staff. Needs are assessed through yearly surveys, where teachers are asked to identify

their interests and needs. This information is used to develop the district's inservice activities. With the exception of last year's topic defined by the superintendent, topics have been selected by the inservice committee working with the information obtained at the building level.

There is also an inservice committee at each building chosen by the principal or from volunteers. They are responsible for assessing needs specific to that building staff and for planning inservice activities at their school. The needs assessment at the building level is usually done at staff meetings. The building committee designs a program that they believe will meet the needs expressed by the teachers. These programs are usually offered after school, and are generally planned by grade levels.

As standard procedure, participants of each planned program fill out an evaluation form and return it to the district's inservice committee. Whether these evaluations are used in planning future programs is unclear.

IMPACT/OUTCOME OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Due in large measure to the district's commitment to staff development and the support the administration gives to its inservice programs, general opinion as to effectiveness of staff development in this district is favorable. Improved communication between teachers, change in attitudes, acceptance and understanding of black students, and greater awareness of alternatives available to teachers are some examples of what the district's teachers felt were positive outcomes of the staff development programs. The administration views improved teacher morale and change in teachers' attitudes toward students as the most significant outcomes of desegregation-related inservice on the staff.

There were mixed reactions on the part of the central office staff and the teachers regarding the need and usefulness of the institutional racism topic for inservice. Though the administration felt it to be of top priority, teachers did not see it as necessary. There was general dissatisfaction with the format used for the initial Professional Day and the consultant was not well received. The group was considered too

large to be an effective work group and the speaker "came on too strong." Teachers felt they were being attacked as racist and resented it.

In terms of overall effectiveness, the district's teachers shared the feeling that the most valuable inservice program is the one designed by the school for its own staff. Most buildings through their staff meetings assess their particular needs. A building inservice committee is then responsible for organizing a program that will meet those needs.

Overall, teachers prefer inservice that will give them specific skills and techniques that they can use in the classroom. The topics may include discipline problems, student motivation, problem-solving, or math skills; but the common denominator is the practicability of what is offered.

In general, most teachers interviewed felt that, in order for inservice to improve, teachers should be much more involved in the actual planning and design of the programs. More inservice should be offered that includes both parent and teacher participation, and followup sessions should be standard procedure for all inservice programs. Teachers expressed a preference for district trainers. These trainers were not necessarily related to the school system, but were familiar with the community and knowledgeable on issues pertaining to the community.

Teachers agreed that the most effective inservice format that can be used is one that offers teachers specific and practical examples they can take back for their use in the classroom. This type of "hands off" program is the preference of those who have participated in inservice programs in this district. The topic/content may be desegregation-related or curriculum-specific, but what attracts participants and assures overall effectiveness is the manner in which the topic/content is presented.

Tarkum Unified School District
Midwest Region

Maureen Carney

INTRODUCTION

Tarkum Unified School District is a composite of city, suburban, and rural areas with 140,000 residents living within a 100 square mile area. The economy of the area centers around many large manufacturing firms which employ a high percentage of the adult population. The distribution of wealth among the inhabitants probably approximates a normal distribution.

The Unified District was established in 1961 erasing, for school purposes, boundaries between several municipalities and merging many school districts into one. Unification made it possible to plan the educational programs of the total 100 square mile area without the political and social restrictions of each municipality. Presently, the district employs over 2,500 persons; nearly 1,600 are professional educators. A student population of some 26,000 makes TUSD one of the largest in the state. Of its 34 schools, 3 are senior high and 6 are junior high.

The minority population of the area was relatively small prior to 1950. At that time only 2.1% of the population were identified as members of minority races residing within the city of Tarkum. By 1960, the minority count was 5.4%; and by 1970, 11%. The minority school population reached 20% by 1970.

DESEGREGATION BACKGROUND

The first noticeable effort to eliminate segregation in Tarkum took place in 1966. Assignments of pupils to a newly-built high school two miles west of the city were made to include the minority population from the inner city of the district. A small segregated junior high was closed and the students distributed to outlying schools,

including a new junior high four miles northwest of Tarkum.

In 1968, the Board of Education took a stand supporting the desegregation of the district by adopting a resolution which includes the following: "Since racial or ethnic segregation reduces the opportunity for social and cultural equality, steps must be made to develop plans for the effective resolution of this educational problem.... To effectively fulfill its function to educate children, the Board of Education will take specific action to erase undesirable cultural-ethnic-racial imbalances."

An older, predominantly minority elementary school was closed in 1970 and the 434 students were reassigned to five suburban schools, despite available space in the inner city schools adjacent to the boundaries of the vacated one. During the same year, boundaries between the two junior highs were adjusted to attain a better racial balance between the two schools. A new junior high was completed in 1973 and attendance assigned so as to racially balance all six of the district's junior high schools.

The Board of Education voted in 1973 to require the Central Office staff to submit four detailed plans, each of which would ensure that as of September 1975 no school in the TUSD would have a minority population in excess of 10% above the percentage of minority students in the district. Special purpose schools such as special education facilities were excluded from this mandate.

Of the four plans submitted, the Board approved one which redistributed minority students in grades 1-6 from seven inner city schools to the other 23 suburban/rural schools in numbers based on the present minority enrollment and capacity of the suburban schools. The excess capacity of the inner city schools was allocated to magnet programs, optional elementary or secondary programs, and special education programs. The Board recognized that each of the four plans had strengths and weaknesses, but judged the "Redistribution Plan" the best one for implementation because it moved the fewest number of children.

The "Redistribution Plan" was implemented in September 1975. A revision of the Board policy restricting the minority population in

each school was adopted in November 1978. The revision requires a lower limit on the percentage of minority students in a school and states that no school shall have a minority population of 10% above or below the percentage of minority students in the district. It was further stated that "those schools that develop an imbalance in the Board's ratio policy will be brought into compliance within two years." The minority population cited for the present school year is about 24% of the total TUSD enrollment, 26.8% in grades K-6.

The kindergartens of the district were not desegregated or included in the plan outlined above because of the opposition of parents to the busing of 5-year olds. However, plans are underway to desegregate the kindergartens as of September 1979.

State requirements for bilingual programs have led to some resegregation of Hispanic students. Half of the class enrollment must be voluntary, majority students. To comply with this regulation the district finds it necessary to locate the bilingual program largely in two schools.

The district has never been under court order to desegregate. The plan which was adopted was a voluntary one which met with some community opposition initially but was accepted without incident once it was clearly to be implemented. Where there was a drop in enrollment concurrent with the desegregation plan, it was attributed to boundary adjustment and the general decline in the birth rate. There are about 5,000 fewer students enrolled now than there were in 1974.

Two years of preparing the community preceded the plan's adoption. Open meetings were held by the Board to hear citizens' opinions. Citizens' advisory committees were involved in developing the plan and assisting in its implementation. Central office staff visited community meetings and church gatherings, and solicited support from business and industry. A "people to people" theme was emphasized to foster cross communication between various role groups, principals, teachers, parents, students.

Much community activity continues into this, the fourth year of the plan's implementation. Home/school workers obtained through ESAA visited each home during the summer and fall of 1975 and continue their

contacts today. Continued effort is exerted by Central Office and school-site staffs to involve parents in school activities and in-service programs. The schools are always open to parents who wish to sit in on classes. The biggest opposition initially and now regards the problems associated with the busing of children over fairly long distances. The burden of this transport is largely on the minority families.

Still to be resolved is the problem of attracting and retaining minority staff and administrators. Of the 70 school-site administrators, 63 are white and 7 are black. Of 1,483 teachers, 1,341 are white, 115 are black, 19 are Spanish-surnamed, and 8 are other minority. Prior to 1975, there were no minority administrators and 10 minority teachers.

A statement of the ultimate desegregation goal of the district is clearly displayed in the offices of district administrators and in the main office of each school building. It reads as follows: "Our ultimate goal is to have classrooms and schools where students and staff live and learn together in a school climate of mutual respect for each other with acceptance of themselves as individuals in a multiethnic multiracial society, with pride in their racial and ethnic heritage, and with awareness of the promise such a climate of mutual trust and understanding has for the greater society in which we all live."

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

There is considerable support for inservice programs for all professional and noncertified staff in the district from the Central Office staff, the Board of Education, principals, teachers, other school personnel, and the community. Distinction is not made between desegregation/integration related inservice and general inservice programs. All efforts at staff development are geared towards providing a better education for each student in the district.

Inservice activities are funded largely through district and federal monies. State money is available to assist with desegregation (mainly transportation) but there is no state money for inservice.

Current District Funded Inservice

The stated purpose of the district staff development program is to provide staff inservice experiences which will enable life needs of students to be better met by the district instructional program. The goals include cross communication among administrators, staff, and Board members; developing student effective skills; ongoing curriculum development to meet student needs; and identifying major problems in the entire school community with the opportunity to brainstorm possible solutions.

A district-wide Institute Day was held in June 1978 to decide priorities for inservice programs. Five areas (communication, discipline, curriculum, make and take, and mainstreaming) were defined within which each school or group of schools would plan an Institute Day program for the 1978-79 school year.

The school-site Institute Day was an approved holiday for the students and a mandatory inservice day (released time) for staff. Special groups such as the social worker counselors either were included in the programs with their home schools or attended special sessions designed to meet their own inservice needs. Funding for these programs was included in the district budget and distributed with Board approval.

In addition to the Institute Day, school principals plan regular staff meetings to meet the inservice needs identified at each school. The teachers' union contract allows the district to require teacher attendance at 38 hours of meetings per year.

Principals are required to attend 14 1/2 hours of meetings planned and conducted by the Central Office staff. During the current year, principals' meetings have dealt with bilingual education, multicultural education, and the assessment of the district's progress in integrating the schools according to the stated ultimate goal mentioned above.

Current Federally Funded Inservice

Tarkum receives federal funds under ESAA for two extensive inservice programs, three-day training programs at the district's Multiethnic Training Center and extended weekend college credit workshops.

The Multiethnic Training Center was opened in the fall of 1976 and since that time has offered a three day program each week of the school year for 8 or 9 of the professional staff of the district. The purposes of the training program are to provide an awareness of racism and sexism and to indicate techniques which can be incorporated into every day curriculum to encourage the acceptance and respect for differences which exist in values, traditions, and behaviors of various racial groups.

Participation in the Training Center program is voluntary and substitute teachers are provided so that released time can be given to teachers. Many Central Office staff members, principals, social worker counselors and other school staff have attended these sessions along with the teachers.

Format for the three days includes human relations' type discussions and sharing sessions, instructional talks, and practical application by way of multicultural projects and/or lessons planned by participants and presented before the entire group. Followup is provided upon request in the form of demonstration lessons taught in the classrooms of teachers who have participated in the program.

ESAA funding pays for the salaries of the two full time professional and one non-professional staff members of the Center, for instructional and printing supplies, and for substitute teachers for participants.

Extended weekend college credit courses are offered at the Multiethnic Center for the TUSD staff. Consultants with expertise in interpersonal relations, cultural awareness, institutional racism, classroom management, material evaluation and other related areas are hired to conduct courses of approximately 15 hours per course. Participation is voluntary and enrollment is generally limited to 75. College credit is the incentive for these programs. Consultants, paid at the rate of $100 per day plus expenses, paper supplies, and facilities are paid for with ESAA funds. About 100 days of consultant time per year are utilized in these courses.

The district received Title IV funding for a three Saturday in-service program on role stereotyping which was held in February 1979. Presenters from three universities and one private organization conducted the lecture/discussion sessions dealing with the following topics: self-analysis in terms of role stereotyping, familiarization with the problem of stereotyping through reading and media materials, techniques to alleviate role stereotyping, and the development of an action plan for sharing insights gained at the workshop with school and community groups.

The workshop was designed to include 175 volunteer participants in the following numbers: 75 teachers, 15 counselors, 30 noncertified school employees, 15 administrators and 40 members of the community. Participants were paid $6 per hour or $90 for the three five-hour sessions. Each participant was required to complete pre and post knowledge tests covering the topics of discussion. In addition, an action plan and post-workshop report was to be given by each participant to a school or community group. Results of the tests and followup presentations are incomplete at the present time. Actual workshop attendance differed somewhat from the planned attendance in that only a few administrators were among the participants.

Inservice Programs of Orientation to Desegregation

In preparation for the implementation of the plan to desegregate the district's elementary schools in the fall of 1975, an inservice program was scheduled to include all of the district's employees and as many community people as would attend. This took the form of a district-wide Institute Day on Institutional Racism and was held during the spring of 1975. An outside consultant from one of the local universities conducted the program in a format of presentation and discussion. Time was provided for small groups to formulate inservice priorities for the coming year.

The district's Title IV director met with school and community groups during the 1974-75 school year. The meetings attracted anywhere from 2 to 300 participants and consisted of discussions relating to the concerns of the particular group in regard to the desegregation

of the elementary schools.

The Central Office instructional staff spent many hours with the Title IV director gathering multicultural materials for the Instructional Materials' Center and going into the schools to help teachers and principals understand the materials. Demonstration lessons were conducted in classrooms upon request.

An administrative retreat for principals and Central Office staff was held during the summer of 1975. Crisis management was the focus of the 3-day meetings conducted by the Department of Justice. Administrators work on a 12-month contract and their participation in the retreat was mandatory. At least one administrators' workshop has been held each summer since 1975. Generally, outside consultants conducted the sessions dealing with human relations and multicultural education.

School-site faculty meetings during 1975 and 1976 dealt with the particular school's problems resulting from desegregation. According to several principals and teachers, the greatest problems of adjustment occurred in the areas of discipline and curriculum adaptation. Frequently, the ESAA director and/or Central Office staff members attended the faculty meetings to facilitate discussion and assist in the resolution of problems.

Inservice programs for noncertified personnel during 1975 included a Saturday human relations workshop for secretaries. The program was voluntary and no stipend was given. The ESAA director arranged the program and invited a speaker from a local university. A similar program was held for the district's school bus drivers.

In Spring 1975, the ESAA home/school workers participated in a week-long training program to prepare them for assisting students and families in the adjustment to new schools. The training sessions included role playing, talks on human relations, and group discussion. The program was mandatory and was held during the regular work hours. As ongoing training, home/school workers met for an hour each month with the ESAA director to discuss the handling of problems encountered in their work. They have been included in many of the voluntary inservice programs offered by the district.

PLANNING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Inservice programs are subject to the approval of the School Board for their content and funding. An Inservice Training Committee composed of one representative from the School Board, two principals, two instructional division representatives, and ten teachers was established by the School Board in January 1978. The Committee is responsible to the Board for evaluating the long-term and immediate inservice needs of the district and for planning programs to assist the professional staff to meet those needs.

The Committee chose to have the district-wide Institute Day to solicit input from all employees in deciding district priorities for inservice programs. The school principals appear to have the most influence on program implementation, both district-wide and school-site.

The program content of the Multiethnic Training Center sessions was planned by its director and coordinator after they had attended a similar program at one of the universities. An informal evaluation by participants at the end of the three-day program has resulted in minor alterations in format.

Courses to be offered for college credit are selected by the director of the Multiethnic Center. Content and format are at the discretion of the individual trainer.

There is no formal evaluation of the inservice programs of the district. Sometimes participants are asked at the end of a program to report their opinion of its effectiveness. There is no official record or uniform use of the evaluation responses by the district.

IMPACT/OUTCOMES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

With rare exception, district administrators, teachers, other school staff and parents related that the year-long preparation for the desegregation of the elementary schools resulted in a smooth transition without serious problems. Key elements cited were the meetings of the Title IV director with teacher and parent groups, school exchange visits by students and parents, and the overall stress on the "people to people" theme. These efforts contributed to a greater awareness of cultural differences, to the reduction of anxieties

and the alleviation of fear, and to the breaking down of stereotypes.

Early in 1976, approximately 400 parents and 300 elementary school employees were randomly selected and contacted by members of the district's Research and Development staff. They were asked if they thought desegregation was working successfully in their school and why it was or was not successful. About 80 percent of the parents and 90 percent of the employees felt that desegregation was working successfully; 10 percent of the parents and 3 percent of the employees felt that it was unsuccessful; and the rest did not know or did not respond. Nearly 20 percent of the parents commented on busing and all of these comments were negative. Positive attitudes, equal treatment of children, prior preparation, and general cooperation of administrators, teachers, parents and children were the reasons for success mentioned by 70 percent of the parents and nearly 80 percent of the employees. Busing and disciplinary problems were the reasons given most frequently by those who felt that desegregation was unsuccessful in their school.

The contribution of specific inservice programs to the preparation for and first year of desegregation cannot be separated from the total effort. The leadership of the Central Office administrators and the involvement of the entire community in the "people to people" activities set the atmosphere within which inservice programs took place. A spirit of cooperation and a desire to learn what was needed to make the desegregation plan work were the prevailing attitudes. The outside consultants and internal staff trainers were carefully chosen and well prepared. Participants responded to the entire package as if it were one program.

Once the desegregation plan was in effect and no major disruptions occurred in the schools, the focus of inservice was turned more towards the instructional program in terms of curriculum adaptation and multicultural education. The Multiethnic Center staff is highly praised by school employees for their ongoing training of staff in multiracial/multiethnic concepts and interactions, and for their assistance with the use of multicultural materials for the classrooms. Administrators, the Center's staff, and most of the teachers who have attended the 3-day program believe it to be very effective in promoting awareness of racist and sexist stereotypes in the textbooks and in society. A few teachers

did not find the program helpful because they had always taught in desegregated schools and felt they were already aware of the children's needs. Some of the nonteaching staff who participated remarked that the program was geared too much towards teachers.

Only a few respondents mentioned attending the extended weekend college-credit courses. Those who did attend had selected courses with a particular need in mind and found the courses helpful and practical.

Questions concerning the annual Institute Days brought mixed reactions from participants. Generally, the district-wide Institute Days are viewed favorably as these result in setting district priorities and in soliciting input from all levels of staff. The impact of the school-site Institute Days depends upon the particular program or speaker. They are considered to be very effective by participants who see them relevant to their individual needs and a waste of time to others who find them repetitious and dull. The respondents within a particular school tend to be in agreement about that school's Institute Day programs.

There were only a few suggestions for improving the district's staff development program:

- The Multiethnic Center program should be extended to five days and should be mandatory for all teachers and principals.
- Continuance of the Multiethnic Center program should be guaranteed in case federal funds are withdrawn. The uncertainty has led to a continual turnover of staff.
- Principals need training to separate "kid problems" from racial problems.
- Ways of obtaining greater minority parent participation in school activities should be addressed.
- Better incentives are needed in order for teachers to participate. The same people attend and are usually not the ones who need it.